that in some cases, our rates are much more favourable. The conditions below the ghats cannot be compared with those obtaining in the plateau.

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolution No. 1.

Measures for balancing the State Budget.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA moved the following resolution on behalf of himself and Mr. B. M. Muniswamappa :—

"This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that they be pleased to follow the following principles in balancing the State Budget and that a committee consisting of official and non-official members be formed to furnish suggestions to bring the said principles into force:

(*a*) that no extension in service be given to any official after his 55th year;

(*b*) that all superfluous offices be immediately abolished;

(*c*) that no new appointments be created without the consent of this Assembly;

(*d*) that no allowance more than one be given to any official in the State;

(*e*) that the existing number of nine districts be reduced by amalgamating small districts;

(*f*) that two or more departments be conveniently amalgamated, wherever possible, in order to cut down the expenditure of the State; and

(*g*) that the existing Sub-Division Offices be reduced as far as possible."

In doing so, the mover referred to the present practice of granting extensions of service to superannuated officers and said that he had, for several years past, been impressing on the Government the necessity of enforcing the rule about retiring from service every officer of Government on his completing the age of 55. But he was sorry to find that Government had not taken the suggestion seriously at all. Meanwhile the Government of Bombay had already put that rule into force within a year after the Congress Ministry had assumed office, and no exception or breach of the rule was allowed in any instance. The mover then proceeded to consider the merits and demerits of the rule relating to the retirement of officers on their attaining the age of 55. First, if that rule was enforced, the substitute for a retired officer would be started on the minimum salary of the graded appointment: and so the difference in salaries of the two persons would be a saving to the Government. Secondly, as a result of the seriatim promotions that would have to be effected in the establishment, the last place would fall vacant and a new recruit would be appointed in that vacancy; this would result in unemployment relief to some small extent. For both these reasons, enforcement of the rule was desirable. As against that, the practice of giving extensions to officers would entail unnecessary expenditure to Government, so that popular feeling was definitely opposed to that practice being continued any longer.

Dealing with the next point, *viz.*, immediate abolition of all superfluous appointments, he invited attention to a question put by Mr. Chamiah, in reply to which the First Member of Council had been pleased to promise that the question of abolishing the post of Personal Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore, would be examined. The speaker would add that a detailed scrutiny would reveal the existence of several such superfluous appointments. Retrenchment committees had been appointed in the past, under the chairmanship, in one case, of Sir K. P. Puttanna Chetty, and in another, of Rajadharmapravina K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar, retired Chief Justice of Mysore. Both the committees had gone minutely into the question and made elaborate recommendations. Most of the recommendations had been accepted by Government in principle, though the speaker was sorry to have to remark that those very recommendations had been observed more in the breach than in the observance. He therefore urged that those recommendations also should be given effect to without further delay.

The next point, he said, related to the question of creating and filling up of new appointments. The people in the villages, who were mostly of limited means, spent their all on educating their children in the hope that the latter might rise to gazetted ranks under Government. But the speaker regretted to say that there was a bitter complaint that higher appointments were not conferred on people from the villages but that they were all going to sons of the

highest officers. This had generated discontent on the part of the people generally, which had culminated in the present agitation against the Government. Even though the speaker was not inclined to call this a powerful reason, the circumstance referred to was serving as a convenient handle for the malcontents to trade upon it and lure credulous youths into the fold of agitators. If only the Government remedied this defect by advising their officers to resist temptation, he hoped that it would be quite possible for the saner elements in the country to disabuse the minds of the said youths and wean them from the influence of the agitators.

The member then referred to the question of allowances drawn by Government officers. As a result of continued opposition from members of the Assembly and of the Council, he was glad to say, 50 per cent of the allowances had now been withdrawn. All the same, they had not disappeared as they ought to. Of course, in rare cases, the grant of an allowance might be called for. In this view, the speaker was of opinion that it would be a move in the right direction if not more than one allowance was granted to any one officer, and even that in very special cases. On this point also the opinion of the proposed committee would be invaluable.

Proceeding, the member said that the next point related to the amalgamation of some of the existing smaller districts. This suggestion, if accepted, would result in bringing back the number of districts to the old level of 8. It was a pity that Government had recently increased the number of districts from 8 to 9, even though the members of the two Constitutional Houses had been agitating for over 10 years that the number of districts be reduced to 6. He was not suggesting a reduction in any light mood; on the other hand, he was prepared to grant that the biggest district of Mysore, for example, ought to be bifurcated in the interests of efficient revenue administration. Such a course could be justified for the simple reason that the Government had successfully converted a vast and barren area into a fertile tract. But as against that, there was the small district of Kadur which had only 7 small taluks and that district could with advantage be amalgamated with the neighbouring district of Hassan. At the time the existing districts were constituted, they might have been necessary in view of the want of facilities like communications, etc. But at the present time when motor cars and buses had conquered both distance and time, there could be no justification for having a large number of high-paid officers with very limited jurisdiction. The districts should therefore be amalgamated and a good part of the expenditure now being incurred could be saved to Government.

Another point mentioned in the resolution related to the amalgamation of departments. Formerly, 2 or 3 departments were being managed by one and the same officer, and that arrangement could well be revived even now. There was also scope for reducing the number of revenue sub-divisions to the barest minimum possible. The Sub-Division Officers were merely acting like post offices between the Deputy Commissioner on the one hand and the Amildars on the other. These officers obviously were superfluous.

By accepting the resolution and appointing a mixed committee as proposed to scrutinize and report upon the proposals indicated above, the Government would be ascertaining ways and means of effecting large economies in the State expenditure, so that they could in future easily balance the budget. For this reason, the mover commended the resolution to the acceptance of the House.

Mr. H. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO seconded the resolution and commended the object of the mover that State expenditure should be economised in all possible directions and the savings utilised for accelerating progress in the State. He agreed with the mover that there was considerable scope for reducing the number of Revenue Sub-Division Officers. It might be argued that if these posts were abolished, the work of the Deputy Commissioners might increase severalfold. He therefore

suggested that in the case of the heavier districts, a Personal Assistant might be appointed to help the Deputy Commissioner concerned.

The member then said that there was ample scope for the amalgamation of departments. Taking the case of the Department of Industries and Commerce, as an instance in point, he pointed out that while formerly there was only one Director, now there were two. No doubt, the work of the department now was much more than ever before, but that could only justify the appointment of some gazetted Assistants to the Director and not bifurcation of the department with a separate establishment, contingencies, etc., for each. To consider whether or not this was so, the appointment of a committee, as proposed, was desirable. That committee could also be requested to consider whether similar retrenchments could be effected in any other departments and which departments could usefully be amalgamated with others.

As regards the reduction of districts, he was of opinion that the mover's suggestion should be accepted without hesitation. By providing a Personal Assistant to each Deputy Commissioner, the extra work involved on account of amalgamation of districts could be easily got through. The speaker had no doubt whatever that the proposed committee would examine, with a due sense of responsibility, the other questions mentioned by the mover such as, doing away with the system of giving extensions to superannuated officers, abolishing all unnecessary appointments, etc.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMY IYER opposed the resolution and categorically adduced the following reasons:—

(*a*) Extension of service was not being granted to officers as a matter of course, but only to those who were very efficient and whose services had to be continued for some time in the interest of Government work, either for want of competent substitutes or for the reason that the retirement of the officials in question would be a distinct loss to the Government.

(*b*) About the abolition of unnecessary posts, the mover had not specifically indicated which posts were superfluous and so the question of abolishing any posts could not arise. Personally the speaker felt that none of the existing appointments was superfluous.

(*c*) On the question of creating new appointments, the speaker felt that it was only the Government and His Highness the Maharaja that were aware of the actual needs of the administration and therefore were competent to judge whether a particular appointment was necessary or not. Members of the Assembly were not in a position to give concrete or useful suggestions in this behalf.

(*d*) Grant of allowances was regulated by well-known financial rules and principles. If any extraneous item of work not pertaining to the person holding a particular appointment was tacked on to him, it was but fair that he should be given some extra emoluments. But such extra payment should last only so long as the extra duties were actually performed by the official. In other words, no permanent addition to his pay could be justified. This was the principle on which the system of granting allowances to officers was based. So no objection could be taken to the system of granting allowances.

(*e*) On the question of reducing the number of districts, it had been admitted by one and all that there was real need for constituting the new Mandya District. As regards malnad districts, though they might be small in area, the villages there were separated by a net-work of forests and hills, abounding in wild beasts and the interior parts of those districts were still without adequate facilities of communications, etc. Special provision was therefore needed to safeguard life and property. Moreover, compared to salaries paid to Collectors in British Indian Provinces, what a Deputy Commissioner in Mysore got was an insignificant sum. Sometimes, one Collector drew more than the salaries of three Mysore Deputy Commissioners put together. It might be that Collectors in British India were in charge of larger jurisdictions than

Deputy Commissioners in Mysore. But it was necessary to keep the districts as at present, especially in the malnad, so that improvement of the economic condition of the backward tracts might receive the personal attention of the district heads.

(*f*) Those who favoured the suggested amalgamation of districts had obviously lost sight of the fact that most departments had now specialised in the work entrusted to them. Such departments should naturally be placed in charge of experts. Amalgamation of such departments with others would be most inadvisable and might result in putting round men in square holes.

(*g*) The abolition of the posts of Sub-Divisional Officers would be highly detrimental to the interests of the raiyats. Even with those officers, several grievances of the raiyats remained unredressed. Seeing that it was not always possible for the raiyats in the interior to go all the way to the district headquarters and interview the Deputy Commissioners, and considering also that the Amildars were not competent to dispose of certain larger questions, Sub-Divisional Officers, who were placed between the Deputy Commissioners and the Amildars, were very necessary.

Referring to the emphasis which was laid on the unemployment problem by the supporters of the resolution while opposing the idea of grant of extensions of service, **Mr. MUNISWAMY IYER** asked how that noble object could be furthered by the other measures which those very members had suggested, such as reduction in the number of districts, reduction in the number of appointments, etc. The effect of accepting those suggestions, on the other hand, would be to intensify the problem of unemployment.

He next referred to the remark made by the mover that simply because a few appointments went to particular individuals who did not come from the villages, there was widespread discontent among the subjects of the State and that the present political agitation also was gaining strength on that account. Mysore was after all an agricultural country and what the agriculturist was more particular about was a good crop and a few amenities like good roads, drinking water, etc., and so long as Government provided all those facilities, the raiyats had every reason to be grateful to the Government and remain quite content, so that the false hopes given to them by interested agitators would produce no effect whatever on them.

Mr. C. V. RAMAN said that the object underlying the resolution was very good and that the resolution deserved the support of the House and the sympathy of the Government.

Mr. S. K. SHANMUKHIAH agreed with all the suggestions made by the mover except the amalgamation of Kadur District with Hassan District. The former was a hilly tract abounding in forests. It was in the heart of the malnad and very backward. The villages were far removed from one another. To combine such a district with Hassan which was a thickly populated district would be of advantage to neither of them. He therefore suggested the continuance of Kadur as a separate district so that the Government could pay special attention to its improvement.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, FINANCE DEPARTMENT (Mr. A. N. Raghavachar) said that he desired to remove certain wrong impressions on the part of those who had pleaded for the acceptance of this resolution. It had been stated by the mover that the Government of Bombay had altogether done away with the system of giving extensions to superannuated officers. The fact was that the age of superannuation in Bombay had long continued to be 60 and it was only quite recently that it was reduced to 55. But in Mysore the age of superannuation had been fixed at 55 from the very beginning. For a temporary period of two years, no doubt, it had been extended to 57 years, but the limit now was only 55. In other words, the principle now adopted in Bombay was being adopted in Mysore from the very commencement. Secondly, he explained that it would not be correct to think that the retirement of an officer would result in savings to Government. For instance, if a person

on Rs. 100 was retired, he had to be given a pension of Rs. 50, and this, added to the salary of the substitute, would increase the expenditure from Rs. 100 to Rs. 150. Ordinarily, however, officers were being retired on their reaching the age of superannuation and it was only in very exceptional cases that extensions were granted; in such exceptional cases, if an officer was really efficient and physically fit, the grant of an extension to him could not be characterised as being opposed to public interests.

As regards the suggestion for the abolition of all superfluous appointments, he said that that question had been examined in detail by the last Retrenchment Committee and the recommendations of that committee had, after examination, been accepted by Government to the extent possible.

On the point that no new appointments should be created without the consent of the Assembly, he said that all high appointments were being specifically provided for and shown in the budget and members of the Assembly as well as those of the Council had sufficient opportunity to express their views in relation to them during the budget discussions. Even apart from that, the speaker could assure the House that the necessity for each and every new appointment was being thoroughly examined by the Government before it was actually sanctioned.

The next suggestion in the resolution was that not more than one allowance should be granted to an officer. Regarding this, **the FINANCIAL SECRETARY** explained that there were several kinds of allowances in vogue, such as Personal, Duty, Conveyance, Fixed Travelling, etc. But each of them was meant to serve a specific purpose, so that if more than one purpose was being served in any case, the grant of more than one allowance could not summarily be turned down; the more important point for consideration in such cases would be whether the total emoluments drawn by a particular officer was disproportionately high, considering the nature of the duties performed by him. The Finance Department would naturally scrutinize the merits of each case. If a fixed travelling allowance was given in a certain case, it must have been given because it was more economical to Government than giving railway fare, mileage, daily allowance, etc., to that individual. Similarly, those who had much touring work every month were given either a horse allowance or a bicycle allowance. Again, for the performance of certain duties of a specialised nature, instead of creating new posts, the services of existing officers were being utilised and a duty allowance, which would not add to expenditure under travelling allowance or under pensions, was being given. Thus it was not true that the grant of allowances meant extra cost to Government. On the other hand, it often resulted in economy.

About the increase in the number of districts to 9, he assured the members that before the formation of the Mandya District was ordered, the necessity for it was thoroughly examined by Government. As the area in question was bringing in extra revenue to Government and stood in need of a lot of improvements under agriculture and irrigation, the formation of a new district was considered to be a real administrative necessity.

Adverting to the suggested amalgamation of departments, he said that if the conditions of work permitted, Government would be prepared to give effect to it.

As regards the appointments of Sub-Division Officers, he said that, as far as possible, and consistently with public interests, these officers had been given the widest administrative charges. But in districts with a larger number of taluks, a few more Sub-Division Officers also would be necessary. He however assured the mover that Government were doing their very best to keep down expenditure in all possible directions.

Continuing, **Mr. A. N. RAGHAVACHAR** said that the resolution contemplated the appointment of a committee to suggest several modes of effecting savings in expenditure in order to balance the budget. But seeing that the Government were already having the

selfsame object in view and doing everything necessary to secure that object, there was no need for appointing any special committee at the present time.

In view of the explanations and assurances given by the Financial Secretary, **Mr. T. L. GANGOJI RAO SALANKEY** suggested that the mover might withdraw the resolution.

In replying to the debate, **Mr. B. L. BYANNA** pointed out that Mr. Y. V. Muniswamy Iyer had referred to several things in opposing the resolution, but that there was no need for the speaker to reply to all those points, even though he could not subscribe to all those statements. His purpose would be served, he thought, by referring to just one point which was relevant. Mr. Muniswamy Iyer had contended that extension of service was being given only to really efficient officers, whose continuance in office even after the age of superannuation was considered to be necessary in public interests. On that point, the speaker argued that it would not be fair to the junior officers in service that Government should go on encouraging particular men by granting extensions of service, sometimes for years together. At that rate, he was afraid that promising young men already in service might go without the chance of earning the promotions legitimately due to them. As regards the other points raised in the resolution, the Financial Secretary had claimed that Government were already effecting retrenchments and economies whenever possible. But the fact remained that representatives of the people were not satisfied on that point. For the purpose of reconciling these two opinions, **Mr. BYANNA** thought it desirable to constitute a committee consisting of representatives not merely of Government but also of the general public to consider the question in all its aspects and make suitable recommendations to Government.

Referring to the statement of the Financial Secretary that Government had accepted all the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committees, he remarked that even 25 per cent of those recommendations had not been given effect to.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) observed that that was not a correct statement. He could assure the House that most of the recommendations of that committee had been accepted by Government and also given effect to.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA, however, did not believe that it was so. He argued that if that had been the case, representatives of the people in the two Constitutional Houses would not have made a grievance of the point that possible retrenchments had not been effected by the Government.

As regards reduction in the number of districts, the speaker assured the House that it was not his idea that the Kadur District in particular should be abolished or amalgamated with any other district. All that he wanted to urge on the attention of Government was that the existing number of districts should be curtailed. While on this question, he was sorry to have to remark that every time the subject was mooted, the Government were giving the same stereotyped answer, knowing that the answer had not convinced the representatives of the people. He hoped that even now the Government would be pleased to accept the resolution and appoint a committee as proposed.

Mr. A. N. RAGHAVACHAR observed that the cost involved in the appointment of a committee might also be considered before urging that the resolution be accepted.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA replied that Government need not be swayed by considerations of cost while dealing with momentous questions.

In conclusion, he hoped that if a special committee was appointed and if all their recommendations were given effect to, all the agitation which was now being set up against the Government would die a natural death. The resolution had been moved in the best interests of both the Government and the public, and the speaker appealed to the House to accept it.

The resolution was then put to vote and declared lost, 69 members voting for, and 86 against.

Resolution No. 2.

Extending the term of the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council and placing the Reform Committee Report before these two Houses for discussion.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA moved the following resolution, on behalf of himself, Mr. B. M. Muniswamappa and Haji N. Doulat Khan:—

"This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that arrangements be made to place the recommendations submitted by the Reform Committee before the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council to be discussed and submit all the final recommendation suitable to the existing circumstances of the State and that in view of the delay arising therefrom, the term of the existing Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council be extended by one year"

He said that at the time the Reform Committee was appointed, doubts were being expressed as to whether the personnel of the committee was really representative of the people. The Government said that it was a representative committee but the people's verdict was otherwise. Popular opinion even now was that it was not a truly representative committee. To obviate the criticisms, it was desirable that before the Government passed final orders on the committee's report the recommendations of the committee should be allowed to be discussed by the members of the Assembly and the Legislative Council. That was a reasonable request, and the Government ought not to have any objection to according it.

The Government might possibly object to the request on the ground that placing the report before the popular Houses might mean delay in passing orders on it and that it would be desirable to pass orders without delay. But the speaker felt that no purpose could be gained by passing orders very early. Even granting that orders on the committee's report were passed within a week or so from date, elections would have to take place in the following March. New electoral rolls would have to be prepared as the franchise had been extended and population also had increased. Even if the barest minimum statutory period required for each item of business in connection with general elections was allowed, the short interval of five months would not be sufficient so that elections could not be held before June 1940.

In the next place, people in British India were agitating for the early establishment of Federation and in Mysore also there was a Federal Committee, but the question had been put off owing to the declaration of war and there was no justification to spend anything more for the present on the local committee. If perchance the war was terminated soon and Federation was established, another election would have to be held in Mysore also. That would entail double expenditure of public money, which ought to be avoided as far as possible.

The speaker then proceeded to refer to the present political situation in the State and said that it was seen from the papers that Mahatmaji had spoken very highly about the wisdom and sympathy of those at the helm of affairs and of the enlightenment of the people. Mahatmaji had also proposed to send two deputies to the State at an early opportunity for re-establishing harmonious relations between the Government and the leaders of the local Congress. The subjects of the State were immensely pleased in particular to know that Mahatmaji had the best impression about Mysore as contrasted with all other Indian States. Such being the case the speaker hoped that the Dewan would not perhaps like to forgo the opportunity of consulting Mahatmaji or his deputies about the proposed reforms also, taking advantage of their projected visit to the State. From this point of view also, it was desirable that Government delayed for some time the passing of orders on the Reform Committee's recommendations.

For all these reasons, it was best that the term of the existing Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council was extended by one year, in which case the Government could also place the committee's report before the two Houses when next they met. The member therefore appealed to the House to

pass the resolution and to the Government to accept it.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA seconded the resolution. The resolution, he said, consisted of two parts, *viz.*, (1) that the Reform Committee's report be placed before the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council, and (2) that the term of the existing Assembly and Council be extended by one year. It was only in case the Government acceded to the first point that the question of granting the second point would arise; and if the Government were not going to agree to the former, the members of the House were not going to press the latter.

Continuing, he said that the State of Mysore was being administered in such a manner that the subjects were all proud of it. As a matter of fact, it was as a result of the progress secured by the Administration that the subjects were aspiring for still greater progress. And as the Government were in sympathy with that aspiration of the people, they should also agree to placing the report of the Reform Committee before the two constitutional bodies of the State. Even according to the terms of the Mysore Treaty, the Government of Mysore were morally bound to consult the opinion of the two Houses in all such matters, because that document contained a condition that whatever new experiment the Administration took up should be such as to promote the best interests of the people. Expression of opinion by the Constitutional Houses was thus virtually the first stage of any such experiment, consideration of such opinion by the Executive Council the second stage, and tendering of proper advice by the Executive Council to His Highness the Maharaja must be the third stage. The first was, in the speaker's opinion, the most important stage for the reason that the reform would have a direct bearing upon the well-being of all the subjects of the State and so they were entitled to know what the reforms were going to be; secondly, by not agreeing to place the report before the people's representatives, the Government would only be helping the present agitation to gain strength and support. Even without reference to any agitation, it would be in the best interests of the State that Government consulted the people before passing final orders on a matter like this. If this point of view was always borne in mind by the Government, there would be no need for the agitators themselves to invoke the interference of all-India leaders. But if agitation in the State gathered strength, it might become an all-India question, in which case, leaders from outside would have to interfere. For, the local agitators felt that they were Indians first and Mysoreans next. The best way of keeping the agitators under check would be by the Government taking the people into confidence and securing their co-operation and support. It was in this view that the speaker seconded the resolution.

Mr. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA supported the resolution and said that the Assembly and the Council which consisted of elected representatives of the people, ought to be consulted before orders were passed on the Reform Committee's report, and that for this purpose, the term of the two bodies must be extended. If this request was turned down by the Government, the constitutional bodies would feel insulted, whereas, if it was granted, the reputation of the State would be enhanced.

Mr. Baliam SRINIVASA RAO, however, was opposed to the resolution. He said that members who wanted the term of the constitutional bodies to be extended were apparently anxious to stick on to their privileged places without having to face general elections. If this request was granted, he feared that a wrong impression would be created that all the sitting members of the two Houses were of the way of thinking described above. For this reason, he urged that general elections be ordered to be held as soon as possible.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH further opposed the resolution and said that if the term of the two Houses was extended in order that the report of the Reform Committee might be placed before them

some months hence, the only impression that would get abroad would be that Government were only adopting dilatory tactics and were averse to granting further reforms. The committee which had taken so long as a year and a half over the recommendations must in fairness be deemed to have discharged its duty with a due sense of responsibility and there was nothing to warrant the hope that any more good would result from a discussion of the report in the two Houses. Besides, it would not be fair to keep the subjects of the State any longer in suspense about the reforms in view; nor would the best interests of the State be served by delaying such reforms. On the other hand, he feared that delay would strengthen the agitation already going on.

The speaker was sorry that the mover, in his introductory remarks relating to the resolution, had made statements calculated to give rise to an impression that the Reform Committee was not representative in character for the reason that all the members thereof were not elected representatives of the people. By way of reply to those statements, he said that he was not aware of any special committees the members of which were elected as such by the people concerned. But Government had seen to it in the present case that the personnel of the committee was as representative as it possibly could be. He fully agreed with the previous speaker that extending the term of the Council and the Assembly would lead to unnecessary delay in the introduction of further reforms, undesirable scope for outside agitators to interfere in Mysore politics and an erroneous impression that members of the existing Assemblies were fighting shy of fresh elections.

After all, the responsibility of satisfying world opinion rested, not upon the mover of the resolution or any other individual members of the Assemblies, but upon His Highness's Government, and it was to the latter that the best means of settling the issue should be left. And nobody who was interested in the progress of the State and the happiness of its people ought to do or suggest anything which would have the effect of delaying the reforms. Mr. Byanna was proud that even Mahatma Gandhi held the administration of Mysore in very high esteem. If the administration should continue to enjoy similar reputation in future also, the Government should be enabled to announce the reforms and also inaugurate them with the least possible delay. In this view, he would appeal to the mover not to press the resolution.

Mr. JATHARE NAIK wholeheartedly endorsed the remarks of the previous speaker.

Mr. B. MARULAPPA was of the opinion that by placing the report before the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council before passing orders on it, the Government would be free from blame of any sort and also meet the view-point that was being urged by those who were carrying on the present agitation. After all, the Government also should try to satisfy all schools of thought as far as possible and not unnecessarily forgo support, if only it could be secured, of even those now in jail. From this point of view, he felt that Government might as well accept the resolution under discussion.

Mr. H. K. MADIAH, who was also in favour of the resolution, said that he was unable to fall in with the views expressed by Mr. Malliah. That member had stated that peace and goodwill should prevail in the State; if he believed so, the speaker would ask him why he had not striven to get those now in jail back. There was something to be said in favour of the contention that the personnel of the Reform Committee was not as representative as it ought to have been; and so long as this was not so, if the popular bodies also were not consulted before orders on the report were passed, and if Government were anxious to pass and enforce their orders based on one-sided opinions, it would be futile to expect the agitators to co-operate with the Government. It would also be wrong to say that those who supported the resolution did so for the reason that they were afraid of facing fresh

elections. Their reason was that if the term of the two Houses was extended, Congressmen in Mysore might reconsider their own attitude and decide, in calmer moments, to co-operate with the Government, in which case, peace and tranquility would follow as a matter of course. From this point of view, the speaker thought that the resolution under discussion was worthy of support from all sections of the House.

It could not be said that placing the report before the Assembly and the Council was unnecessary or harmful to any interest. Seeing that the Assembly had accepted the principles of such a contentious piece of legislation as the Public Safety Act, it might be expected that even on the question of reforms, the members would make only reasonable recommendations. But even granting that the Assembly made nay impracticable proposals, they would not be binding on the Government. At the same time, the Government would have the satisfaction of having consulted representatives of the people on such an all-important question.

Mr. A. VENKATESIAH in further supporting the resolution said that if Mysore enjoyed a high reputation, it was mainly because its constitution was based on the Rule of Law. Having followed that wise policy for long, the Government might do it in connection with the present question also and agree to place the report before the two constitutional assemblies before any orders were passed on it. Secondly, whatever the extent of the reforms in view, one thing was beyond doubt, *viz.*, that both the Legislative Council Act and the Representative Assembly Act would have to be amended. And as these Acts were matters of direct concern to the members of the two bodies, it was but natural that the members liked to have an opportunity of having their say in the matter before it was too late. It would be very uncharitable on the part of anybody to suggest that only those who would cling to their seats were suggesting an extension of the term of the present Council and Assembly. It must be granted that there were at least a few among the sitting members who sincerely believed that by serving in either House they were serving both God and Man. But none of them was under the delusion that continuing as members was by any means the only way of serving the public.

Having said this, the speaker reverted to the question of placing the report before the two Houses and observed that by doing so, the Government would in a way be taking a referendum. Nobody was anxious, he thought, to continue as a member for long without having to face general elections. Nobody even would suggest that the report should be placed before the Assembly only at the following Budget Session. It was quite open for the Government, if only they were prepared to place the report before the Assembly, to summon a special session, a joint session, if it came to it, of both the Council and the Assembly. But even if it was placed before the Budget Session and consequently the passing of orders was delayed to some extent on account of that, no great interests were going to be sacrificed. He hoped the Government would see eye to eye with this view and accept the resolution.

Mr. B. L. HUTCHAPPA suggested that Government need not extend the term of the existing Assembly and Council provided they agreed to place the report at least before the Houses to be reconstituted. All that he was particular about was that the two Houses should have an opportunity of expressing their opinion about the committee's recommendations.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY said that on a question of supreme importance like the proposed reforms, the Government ought to consult the opinion of the costitutional bodies of the State. It was true that a special committee sat long over this matter and submitted its report, but no one could aver that the committee consisted of members who were all-knowing and infallible. Appellate courts sometimes found that the Judges presiding over the courts of original jurisdiction were wrong in arriving at decisions. It was within the experience of many a person that

he would, on reconsideration, have to revise his own opinion or judgment as previously arrived at. Such being the case, the Government would be harming none but satisfying all if they accepted the resolution though they were certainly free to arrive at whatever decisions they thought proper after hearing the views and opinions of the two Houses. The subjects of the State were its most valuable asset and by satisfying all schools of thought, the Government would be strengthening their own hands and incidentally gaining the time within which they could bestow some more calm consideration on the question under discussion. He had great pleasure, therefore, in supporting the representation.

Mr. MAYI GOWDA thought that by discussing the report, the Assembly and the Council would only be supplementing the work of the committee. He saw no harm in the resolution being accepted.

Mr. G. MALLANNA opposed the resolution. The report of the Seal Committee was not placed before the Assembly or the Council before Government passed their orders on it. There was no necessity to make a departure in the case of the present report. Secondly, there would have been some justification in preferring such a request if the committee had been appointed by the Assembly or the Council; and the committee having been appointed by the Government, it was only fair that Government should pass orders on its report without undue delay.

Refuting the suggestion made by one of the earlier speakers, *viz.*, that if the term of the existing assemblies was extended, the present agitation would die out, the speaker asked why the agitation had not subsided even though the committee had taken as long as 18 months over its deliberations; and he made bold to say that any further delay in passing orders would, if at all, render the political situation intolerable.

On the side issue whether or not it was a fact that some of the members were eager to cling to their seats, he preferred to keep silent. But so far as the main point was concerned, he was sincerely of opinion that for various reasons it was exceedingly desirable not only to expedite the issue of orders on the committee's report but also to implement them without any delay whatsoever.

Mr. TIPPU SULTAN ALI KHAN also supported the resolution. In asking that the report of the committee be placed before the Assembly, it was not the object of anybody to get an opportunity of remarking either that the committee had not discharged its responsibilities satisfactorily or that the reforms recommended by them were not adequate. The only object was that in a matter concerning the rights and privileges of the House the members thereof should have some idea of how things were shaping themselves. To that harmless intention, he thought, nobody need take objection.

In moving and seconding the resolution, Mr. Byanna and Chandrasekharaiya had spoken, he remarked, as if they had seen the final report of the committee. Mr. Malliah who was a member of the committee but who differed from the said two speakers, had sounded a note of warning that if orders were delayed any longer, a wrong impression might get abroad that Government were adopting dilatory tactics and averse to the grant of any further reforms. The speaker himself, having no such personal knowledge, could make no definite statements relating to the contents of the report itself.

But there was one point on which he could not agree with Mr. Malliah, *viz.*, that the report need not be placed before the Assembly or the Council because the Seal Committee's Report had not been placed before them. The two committees, the speaker observed, did not stand on all fours. While the former committee had been appointed by Government, more or less on their own initiative, the latter had come into existence as a matter of necessity and as a result of repeated demands from the representatives of the people for a further constitutional advance. But for popular agitation this committee would not have come

into being. And the committee itself having been constituted on account of popular agitation, it was but right that the recommendations of such a committee should receive popular approval.

Some one had remarked that the personnel of the committee was not quite so representative as it should have been. The speaker was inclined to subscribe to that remark for the reason that subsequent to the appointment of the committee, certain individuals had secured places on it in the name of the Congress. He was unable to know why that was done and whether the Government were of the opinion that no others were available to serve on the committee who were as able as, or abler than, those new members. However the thing was done and the report of the committee was now before the Government. Members of the constitutional bodies were anxious to know before it was too late what that report contained. The Government also would be strengthening their own hands if before passing orders on the report they enlisted the support of the people's representatives. Even as regards the merits of the recommendations of the committee, members might wish to express an opinion. For instance, some of them were of opinion that true principles of democracy required something more than the mere appointment of one or two non-official ministers or a mere widening of the franchise. All the ambitions of law-abiding citizens might not be fulfilled by granting reforms of such a nature. After all, experience elsewhere had shown that a non-official minister would cease to be a non-official after accepting office. Again, an officer rising from the lowest rungs of the ladder would any day be better and more experienced than one on whom greatness might suddenly descend. In the interests, therefore, of both good government and progress, members of the constitutional Houses owed a duty to the State as a whole, *viz.*, to consider the proposed reforms in all seriousness and freely to express their views before the Government took their decisions on the recommendations of the committee.

Bearing all these points in mind, he appealed to the Government to accept the resolution without even the least hesitation.

Mr. Shampur PAPANNA who also spoke in favour of the resolution observed that the two constitutional assemblies were like the two eyes of the State and that the Government ought to consult both of them before any important legislative or constitutional reform was decided upon, lest the importance of the said assemblies should be undermined. There was also some danger in rushing to announce any reforms without considering them at sufficient and length in all their aspects and effecting them without due calm and caution.

Lokasevaniratha Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY was of the opinion that the case of the committee in question was not similar to that of the Seal Committee and that it was necessary to consult the Assembly before orders were passed on the report now under consideration.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH supported the resolution without however subscribing to all the wrong and interested versions given by present-day agitators to the acts and intentions of the benevolent Government of His Highness the Maharaja or even to the unfair comments made by such agitators about the personnel of the Reform Committee. He agreed with previous speakers in that the two committees referred to were unlike each other, especially in respect of the circumstances which had led to their appointment. He differed from Mr. Malliah's view that because the Reform Committee had taken a year and a half over the report, no further time should be wasted before passing orders thereon. It was desirable to take a few more months if necessary to consult popular opinion. The time thus taken would be nothing compared to the period for which the reforms to be announced were to be in operation. One or two members had struck a correct note when they said that nobody was anxious to cling to his seat and that it was not for such a reason that anybody urged that the term of the existing constitutional bodies be extended,

One could serve the public as well from outside such bodies as from within. Even if the Assembly and the Council were not consulted now and Government passed orders straightway, at least at the stage of amending the Acts the Houses would have to be consulted and that opportunity would naturally be availed of by the members to express their opinions on the proposed reforms. Instead of allowing an expression of opinion at that stage, the speaker thought that it would be far better for the Government to invite opinions before passing orders on the report.

Mr. Rayara KEMPANNA joined the other members who had supported the resolution and suggested that if Government were anxious to avoid delay, they might convene a special session of the two Houses and consult their opinions about the proposed reforms.

Mr. K. MUNIVENKATAPPA observed that the Reform Committee was appointed as a result of Congress agitation, that at that time a large number of members of the Assembly were Congressmen, that these had since resigned their membership of the House and that they would keep up the agitation in future also if the Government passed orders without consulting the Assembly or consulted the Assembly as at present constituted. It would be far better, therefore, if Government ordered frseh elections without any delay, held up orders on the Reform Committee Report till after the elections, consulted the Assembly as reconstituted and then passed orders.

Mr. A. N. RAMA RAO was, however, inclined to think that if Government passed orders very early, all agitation might subside. The committee consisted of members representing various schools of political thought and had taken sufficient time in considering the question in all its bearings. The Government also were bestowing their best consideration and should be expected to pass orders calculated to further the best interests of the State. Not much was going to be gained by the Assembly and the Council discussing the report at this stage. If later on, before amendments to the Act were made, the Assembly was consulted, it might be of greater use to public interests than if the report alone was placed before the Assembly. That would also serve a double purpose, *viz.*, (*a*) that Government would not be blamed to be delaying reforms unduly, and (*b*) that those who wanted the constitutional Houses to be consulted before the reforms were given effect to would also be satisfied.

Mr. K. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO observed that Mysore had made steady progress for long as a result of the solicitude of the administrators for the best interests of the subjects of the State. Thanks for all the steps taken by those administrators of the past, the subjects of the State to-day had reached a stage when they hoped they were able to play a larger and nobler part in the Councils of the State than their forefathers did. This was a natural aspiration on their part and Government would only be recognising this fact by acceding to their request that the report be allowed to be discussed in the two Houses. Besides, the reforms were going to affect the public at large and it was but fair that public opinion was consulted before the reforms were decided upon. But consulting the public as a whole was obviously not feasible and the utmost that could be done in that direction was to consult the constitutional bodies. Not only was such a step desirable in the interests of harmony in public life but it was a constitutional right of the two bodies to offer their opinions about the reforms. When every citizen was free to give evidence before the Reform Committee, it would be illogical to argue that the constitutional bodies which were representative of all the citizens were not free to express an opinion about such reforms, whether the Government were going to accept such opinion or not. At the time the Reform Committee was constituted, His Highness the Maharaja had expressed the hope and wish that the result of their recommendations would promote the best interests of the people. If that hope and wish was to take full

effect, the Government ought to give the representatives of the people an opportunity of stating their views before it was too late.

In view of all the foregoing considerations, the speaker appealed to the Government to accept the resolution.

Notice of an Adjournment Motion.

At this stage, the PRESIDENT stated that Mr. B. L. Byanna and about 120 other members had given notice of an adjournment motion regarding the proposed levy of fees in middle schools and that it might be moved at 4 of the clock the same day.

The House rose for lunch at 3 p.m. and reassembled at 3-30 p.m.

Resolution No. 2—*concld.*

NAWAB SHER KHAN stated that Mysore was called a Model State because the Representative Assembly of Mysore was started before any other similar Assemblies were started elsewhere in India and even before the subjects agitated for the establishment of such a popular House. Ever since its establishment, the House had done good work and built up a high reputation. It was a representative assembly in the real sense of the term, and also the largest and most important political body in the State. All the communities and interests in the State enjoyed representation on it. It was necessary and desirable that the members of such an important House should be consulted in regard to the proposed reforms. Members of the House were now not aware of the nature of the recommendations of the committee and were therefore anxious to know it well in advance of the Government Order thereon. After all, the views and the opinions of the Assembly were not binding on the Government, as the House was only a consultative body. The Government, therefore, had nothing to lose by giving the House an opportunity to discuss the recommendations. Some members had stated that such an opportunity need not be discussed by the Assembly. In reply to that he would only say that the two cases were quite different. Times were not what they were at the time of the first report, and the Assembly now enjoyed powers and privileges which it did not possess then. The political awakening of the people was also very much greater at present. In view of the present conditions, Government would do well to ascertain the views of the House.

Mr. B. CHAMIAH said that he was not in favour of the resolution. After all, the members of the Reform Committee were representatives of the public and were gentlemen who commanded the confidence of one and all. Nowhere else were constitutional bodies consulted before orders re-shaping their destinies were passed. The Indian constitution was framed and approved by persons living thousands of miles away from India and that system was binding upon India. So there was no justification in preferring the request contained in the resolution. On the other hand the mover and his supporters had reason to be grateful to the Government because it was the representatives of the people who had considered the question and worked out a constitution which was most suitable for the State. There was nothing further to be considered. So, instead of wasting any further time over the question Government might proceed to pass orders on the report and also notify that general elections should take place. He wished in conclusion that those who were members of the Council and the Assembly formerly but were now in jail come back soon and give the Government their best co-operation as members of the two Houses under the new constitution.

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA thought that the present agitation was due to the fact that people wanted liberal reforms, and that unless the reforms were announced, the agitation would go on. Even the Public Security Act was intended to prevent the present agitation, and if only the reforms were announced, there would be no need to enforce the Act because the agitation would then subside of its own accord.

If, as requested, the report was placed before the House, there was sure to be some difference of opinion which itself might lead to further agitation. So it was best not to place the report before the House. After all, His Highness the Maharaja knew what was best for his subjects, and whatever reforms were called for in his gracious opinion must be gratefully accepted by the people. If after some time, further reforms were considered desirable, His Highness would not hesitate to grant them.

Government had appointed a committee consisting of the best available members and spent so much money over it. When that committee had arrived at certain recommendations it would not be right or proper for members of the Assembly or the Legislative Council to insist that they also should be consulted about those recommendations before orders were passed.

This being so, the speaker was of the opinion that there was no need for extending the term of the Assembly and of the Council.

Mr. Khaji SYED YUSUF SAHIB was of opinion that it would not be practicable for the Assembly to discuss the contents of the voluminous report of the Reform Committee even if this was placed before it. And discussion at the present stage would not also serve any useful purpose; it might drag on for months together and yet all the members might not come to an unanimous decision. If the report was not to be placed before the Assembly, the question of extending its term would not arise at all. The Government might proceed to pass orders on the recommendations of the committee, frame the necessary Acts and give effect to the reforms without any delay.

Mr. K. N. PUTTANNA supported the resolution. He said that members of the Reforms Committee were no doubt men of wide experience and sound judgment and their opinions were worthyof respect. But as Mr. Tippu Sultan Ali Khan said, the representatives of the public merely wanted an opportunity of knowing what the report contained. They did not also like to forgo their privilege of discussing a question which concerned their own future. If the report was not placed before the popular House and Government passed orders according to their own lights, it might give room for at least some to say that as all the members of the committee were nominees of the Government, they had recommended only such reforms as the Government themselves had decided upon. Instead of exposing themselves to such a charge, they might as well be rid of the responsibility by shoving it on the people. The Government need not think that anybody was anxious to criticize the report or oppose the recommendations of the committee merely for the sake of criticizing or opposing them After all, it would be well if representatives of the people were consulted on such an important subject, and he saw no justice in anybody seeking to deny them that common privilege.

Mr. GANGOJI RAO SALANKEY stated that the subjects of the State had every confidence that Government were safeguarding the interests of every interest, and there was no need for agitation of any kind in the State. For the same reason he also considered it unnecessary to ask that the report of the committee be placed before the Assembly for discussion. The committee had done its work quite well and members of the House should help Government to pass orders on the committee's report and introduce the contemplated reforms without unnecessary delay. He therefore opposed the resolution.

Mr. DONDE GOWDA stated that the committee had been appointed for recommending further reforms so that there might be no more agitation in the State. They had formulated their proposals after duly considering the views and opinions of various sections of people in the State. That was some time back, and now people were anxious to know what they were going to get in the shape of further reforms. Satisfying that anxiety was more important than extending the term of the Assembly. So, whether the term of the Assembly was extended or not, the Government must place the report before

the House for an expression of its opinion, so that the Government might consider that opinion also and then pass orders on the report. That would establish harmony and understanding between the Government and its people and there would be no more agitation.

Mr. SYED MOHIYUDDIN HUSSAIN, speaking against the representation, said that it was not correct to say that agitation would cease to be if the report was placed before the House, or even if the reforms were announced at an early date. The speaker was of opinion that the agitation itself was due to the Congress leaders, who were just then in jail. But the moment they came out of jail they would again set up agitation of some kind or other. Even if the report was placed before the House, opinions would vary about the nature of the reforms and agitation would again follow. Bearing this in mind the Government might straightway pass such orders as they thought best on the report in question.

Mr. MISRILALL PARASMALL spoke as follows:—

Sir, by asking Government to place the report of the committee before the Assembly for discussion, we ourselves would be delaying the introduction of Reforms. Already some interested agitators are accusing the Government of unnecessarily delaying orders. So I request the entire Huose to keep full confidence in the Government and ask them to introduce whatever reforms might have been recommended in the report. I admit that there may be some defects in the report. For that reason, the Government may also consider the various suggestions given so far by some of the members of this House as well as by others, before issuing orders.

Secondly, regarding extension of the term of this Assembly, it is a reasonable request and I hope Government will surely make an announcement about it in the Dewan's concluding speech. Extension of the term of Houses of Legislature is common even in British India under circumstances similar to those prevailing at present in Mysore. However, Government are the best judges to decide that question.

Mr. P. SUNDARA said that the resolution related to two questions, *viz.*, placing the report of the Reforms Committee before the Assembly and the Legislative Council and extending the term of the two Houses. The latter question, he said, was not of much interest to him, but he was interested in the first, namely that the report of the committee be placed before the Assembly and the Council. These Houses were entitled to let the Government know their views and opinions with regard to the recommendations of the committee. Mr. Lakshminarayana Rao had already dealt with that aspect of the question and he would endorse the statements made by that member with reference to it. Everybody believed—and particularly the minority communities had no doubt whatever—, t h a t Government would do everything necessary f o r securing the best interests of all concerned. But that was no reason why the two Houses should forgo their privilege of expressing their views on a matter of such great importance to the State and all its subjects.

It was poor comfort for members of the Assembly to see that only two of their collegues could participate in the deliberations of the Reforms Committee. And it was said that there was no unanimity of opinion among the members of the Reforms Committee itself, as to final recommendations, for several members were reported to have submitted dissenting notes. That was one of the reasons why members were anxious that the report should be placed before the Assembly as a whole.

Mr. Khaji Syed Yusuf Sahib had remarked that the voluminous report of the committee could not be thoroughly understood and discussed by members of the Assembly within the short space of time at their disposal, and that for that reason, it was not necessary to place the report before the Assembly. By way of reply to that, the speaker stated that nobody was suggesting any detailed examination of the report by the Assembly. It would be enough if members were given an opportunity of

knowing at least the salient recommendations so that, if necessary, they might make any useful suggestions.

In replying to the debate, Mr. B. L. BYANNA referred to the views expressed by Mr. S. C. Malliah in opposition to the resolution. He recapitulated that that member had remarked that it would not be proper to criticize the views of the members of the Reforms Committee. Differing from that opinion the speaker observed that the question of introducing reforms was perhaps the most important matter concerning the future welfare of the State and its subjects and such a matter ought to come up before the constitutional bodies of the State. So many committees had been appointed in the past in various connections and the reports of all such committees had been placed before the Assembly and the Council for opinion even though their opinion was not binding on the Government. In the next place, reforms were essentially a question of legislation and no legislative measure could be taken by Government without placing a statement of general principles of such a measure before the Assembly. Government could not also enforce a legislation unless its provisions were discussed and agreed to by the Legislative Council. That procedure having been followed in respect of even less important pieces of legislation, the Government could not deviate from it in the case of a much more important legislative measure, *viz.*, introduction of reforms.

Again, compared to the size and importance of the Houses of Legislature, the Reforms Committee could only be regarded as something like a sub-committee. There might be some difference as to whether it was so or not, technically, but as a matter of fact it was a sub-committee so that its report was bound to go before the two Houses of Legislature.

In these circumstances there was no warrant for the observation of Mr. S. C. Malliah that discussing the recommendations of the Reforms Committee would amount to insulting the members thereof.

Mr. G. Mallanna had raised an objection to placing the report under reference before the Assembly and the Council, on the ground that the Seal Committee's report had not been placed before them. In reply to that objection Mr. Byanna reminded the House that the legislative powers now enjoyed by the Assembly were granted as a result of the recommendations of the Seal Committee, so that at the time the report of that committee was examined by Government, the Assembly did not have those powers. So the question of placing the report of that committee before the Assembly did not arise at all. In other words, the circumstances relating to the 1923 Reforms were quite different from those concerning the reforms now under discussion.

The personnel of the committee was not fully representative in character. There were differences of opinion on this point, right from the commencement, and though Government did not at first subscribe to that view, they later included a few more members with a view to making the committee more representative of all the interests concerned. That was another reason why the report of such a committee should be placed before the two constitutional Houses, more especially the Assembly which, as its very name indicated, was the only "representative" body in the State.

Proceeding to refer to the nature of the reforms in view, the speaker stated that the people of the State were not going to be satisfied with mere appointment of one or two non-official ministers. What the people wanted was a real and substantial share in the administration and the privilege of being consulted through their elected representatives on each and every matter of importance. The Government might perhaps say that this was already being done; and if so, he would ask what objection, in that case, the Government could have to consulting the Houses of Legislature on the question under consideration now.

Again, the members of the existing Assembly and Council would have to assure their constituencies that their opinion was consulted with regard to the reforms. If they were not in a

position to say so, they would have to feel ashamed at being members of a so-called Representative Assembly which did not enjoy the privilege of being consulted on such an important question as the future constitution of the State.

Lastly, the speaker referred to the analogy of Government having consulted the Assembly with regard to placing the Public Security Act on the Statute Book, though they had already decided to do so and even issued it as an Emergency Act. Government had so acted in that matter for the only reason that they did not want to take all the blame for enacting an unpleasant legislation like that and preferred to share the responsibility for the Act with the representatives of the people. For that same reason, the Government would do well to place the report of the Reforms Committee also before the popular Houses and enlist the support of the members thereof before passing orders on the report.

Speaking for Government, **the FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau)** said that he was glad that this resolution was discussed at such great length. And while the view that it was necessary and desirable to place the report of the Reforms Committee before the Assembly and the Council was shared by certain members of the House, not a few had expressed themselves in opposition to that view and also adduced sufficient reasons in support of the stand taken up by them. Mr. Malliah was one of those who had taken up such a stand, and the speaker was inclined to agree with the views and opinions expressed by him.

The first question that would arise in connection with this resolution was whether it was really necessary to place the report before the Assembly and the Council? So far as Government were concerned, no such necessity was felt. Because the committee included about four members of the Assembly, about ten members of the Council, and some other non-officials who were prominent in the public life of the State. That committee had issued a questionnaire to a very large number of individuals and associations, and as many as 440 had responded and sent up memoranda. In the course of their deliberations, the committee had taken care to consult, as far as possible, all shades of opinion and all schools of political thought, and also examined a large number of individuals and representatives of known institutions; and the report submitted by the committee had assuredly taken into consideration all those memoranda and the views and opinions expressed by all those examined. The committee itself consisted of members representing different schools of thought. Bearing all this in view, it could not be said that any good was going to result from placing the committee's report before either House for further discussion. Even if the report was so placed, there was no reason to expect that any views or opinions not already placed before the committee were going to be expressed by the members. Every reasonable view had already been urged before the committee and there was little scope for the emergence of a new point of view.

One or two of the supporters of the resolution had referred to the constitutional right of the members of the Assembly to express their opinions on questions like the present. It looked as though there was a slight misapprehension on the part of the members who had advanced that argument. The Assembly, no doubt, was a legislative body, but it could not frame a new constitution. That power was vested only in His Highness the Maharaja. That being so, the question how the Acts relating to the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council were going to be amended, was one which neither of those bodies could discuss. That was the position under the law at present.

As a few members had rightly observed, the amendment of the Representative Assembly and Legislative Council Acts was not within the competence of the two Houses. It had been stated that placing the report before the Assembly might be of some use, *viz.*, that by doing so Government would be sharing their responsibility for the

reforms, such as they might be, with the representatives of the people. Government could not accept such a suggestion, nor could they shirk their responsibilities in that manner.

To say this was not to deny that there might be some little use in placing the report before the Assembly. But that would necessarily lead to delay, because they would have to wait till June 1940 for another session of the Assembly, in the normal course. Even if Government proposed to summon a special session, that could not be done earlier than March or April of the said year. Granting such a session was summoned, Government would have to place the report, after such session, before the Legislative Council. Various suggestions might be offered in each of the two Houses and all of them would have to be gone into again. That necessarily would mean a lot of needless delay, and from this point of view, Mr. Malliah was perfectly justified in his observation that placing the report before the two Houses was neither necessary nor desirable.

Some members had urged the view that an early announcement of Reforms would "appease" the agitators, and that "harmony" in the political life of the State would be re-established. If that was so, it would certainly be advisable to deal with the matter without any delay. This exactly was the view of Government and they were trying their best to avoid delay. But the steps to be taken in that direction would necessarily take some time. The Act would have to be drafted first. Rules would have to be framed, and then the question how the several constituencies should be arranged would have to be considered —probably a separate committee would be necessary for that—and, lastly, electoral rolls would have to be prepared. All that was bound to take time It was very difficult for the speaker to say, at the moment, whether there was time enough for all that before the following session. More likely than not, there was not sufficient time for it. For these reasons Government regretted their inability to accept the resolution under discussion and place the report before the two constitutional assemblies of the State. It would best serve all the interests concerned if Government, instead of allowing avoidable delays to occur, proceeded with the further stages of work referred to above, which alone would necessarily take some more months. If in the meanwhile, as was hoped by some of the previous speakers, those gentlemen who, for reasons of their own, had just ceased to be members, also made up their minds to re-join their honoured colleagues in the Assembly and the Council, Government for their part would be very happy indeed.

The resolution was then put to vote and passed by a vast majority.

At this stage the **FIRST MEMBER of COUNCIL** (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) took the Chair.

Adjournment Motion.

Levy of Fees in Middle Schools.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA then moved an adjournment motion as follows:—

That the House be adjourned to discuss an urgent matter of public importance, *viz.*, 'the policy underlying the proposed and contemplated levy of school fees in the middle school classes in the State.'

In doing so, he stated that at present fees were not being levied in middle schools. But as it was rumoured that Government were proposing to levy fees, there were fears and disatisfaction among the public. If there was any truth in the rumours, he wished to know the reasons why it was proposed to levy fees. Even without fees, so many children of school-going age in the State were not availing themselves of the educational facilities available to them and the percentage of literacy was still very low. The percentage would fall further if fees were levied.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU replied that it would perhaps be well if the member first knew the circumstances under which the question of levy of fees in middle schools had arisen. The mover seemed to think that Government had taken the initiative in the matter,

but the speaker could assure him that that was not the case. It was the Elementary Education Committee that had made certain proposals in that connection, and what those proposals were, would be explained by the Director of Public Instruction. If after hearing the Director, the member felt like moving the adjournment motion, he was welcome to do so.

The DIRECTOR of PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Mr. E. G. McAlpine) then spoke as follows :—

The question of the imposition of fees in middle schools in the State is not one which emanated from the Government side of this House, as I imagine many members think. In January 1937 a proposal was brought forward in the Legislative Council by two non-official members, and not by Government, that fees should be imposed in middle schools and that all those who were paying income-tax should pay those fees. That proposal was withdrawn on the assurance that Government had this matter under consideration. Since then the subject has been raised in this House on another occasion, and in the Dasara Session of the Representative Assembly in 1937, the Dewan alluded to this question in his Opening Address and he again alluded to it in the Opening Address this year.

The position so far as middle schools are concerned is simply this: We have come to the point when little further in the way of expansion can be done unless additional funds can be found. Government have, during the past 4 or 5 years, given about 25 new middle schools. In addition to that number, Government have given over 200 additional teachers in the last 4 years. These additions are taxing the financial resources of Government, and yet the demand is not satisfied. I have in my department a list of places which are asking for new middle schools. There are about 80 different places on my list that are waiting for middle schools. This year Government were able to give 5 new schools. Five new schools does not help very much with 80 demands. It is better than nothing, no doubt, but it leaves 75 demands unfulfilled, and even if Government can give the same number next year the demand will increase. It is going on increasing every year.

In addition to the demand for new schools, the members of this House are constantly inviting the attention of Government to the state of equipment of the existing schools. In this House this morning I was told about overcrowding in the Maharani's Middle School. I have also been told of overcrowding in the Sultanpet Middle School in Bangalore City. I do not actually need to have my attention drawn to these cases. I have visited a very large number of schools since I became Director, and I know what the state of affairs in these schools is. I also know how much the equipment is below what it should be and how much overcrowding there is, and how necessary the bifurcation of the larger schools is. But the financial implications of these measures are such that Government cannot consider them, and at the same time continue to give free middle school education. This concession is a concession which is not known anywhere else. It was given 20 years ago in this State, at a time when, according to the inspection reports of the department, it was difficult to believe that it could have been afforded, even then. In those 20 years, the numbers reading in our middle schools have multiplied themselves by three, and the demand goes on. Now, there are in this State many people who can afford to pay for the middle school education of their children —that fact is admitted by everybody— and it is only a question of finding a way by which we can make them pay. The committee appointed to go into the working of the Elementary Education Act considered the question of middle school education as an addendum to their own work. Those of you who have read the *interim* report of that committee will remember that they discussed the question of opening one thousand new primary schools within the next 4 years. It is obvious that if you increase the number of primary schools by one thousand in 4 years, you are at the same time going to increase

the potential numbers wanting admission into middle schools. The committee therefore felt that they must invite the attention of Government not only to the question of primary schools but to the repercussions which that would have on middle school education. One thousand new primary schools obviously means many more pupils, and of these, a certain proportion will naturally want to continue their education. As soon, therefore, as Government do anything to implement the findings of this committee, they are going to be faced with a still more serious question as regards additional middle schools.

Now, the committee have proposed the following general scheme for the consideration of Government. They have proposed that in district and taluk headquarters—not in rural places—fees should be imposed on boys and half fees on girls, with the following limitations. The committee recognises quite well that in district and taluk headquarters there are poor people as well as people who can afford to pay. They have suggested that a liberal provision of freeships to the extent of 40 per cent —I think it is a very generous provision —may be given in middle schools in district and taluk headquarters. In rural places it is not proposed that fees should be imposed. The money received from those who will pay, that is, from the remaining 60 per cent, is estimated to amount to between one lakh and a lakh and a quarter, a year.

Now, the suggestion is not that Government are going to benefit by the fees paid by parents. The suggestion for the consideration of Government is this: that Government will continue to give—under normal financial conditions, that is to say—the same financial support to middle school education which they are now giving. The additional money received from fees, it is suggested, should be funded, in order that it may not lapse into the general closing balance. And that money, a lakh of rupees or more every year, it is suggested, should be spent on middle schools. You, ladies and gentlemen, all come from places where you see these schools. I see them when I go on tour. There are schools with no furniture, places with inadequate furniture, libraries that have not enough books, schools that need more maps, schools that require one additional room or two additional rooms and so on. It is proposed to meet these requirements out of the fund that would be constituted from these fees, so that those who are able to pay fees will have the satisfaction of knowing that what they pay is not going into the general revenues of Government, but is going back into the schools themselves, that every penny of it will be spent on equipment, on buildings, and on bettering the general condition of these schools.

Now, Government are considering this matter at the moment. What their final decision will be, of course, it is not for me to say. I do not know what it will be, in fact. But I would like members of this House to think very seriously and realise that, if they want more schools, something will have to be done in the way of additional financial help. And the obvious way to do it, in my opinion, is that those in the towns who can afford to pay should be asked to pay. I do not think that with the 40 per cent freeships there should be any reasonable grievances. When the additional money is all going back for the good of the schools, then, I think, people will realise that they are going to benefit in the long run out of the fees of the kind suggested.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. J. Appaji Gowda) interpreted the Director of Public Instruction's speech in Kannada.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA enquired whether the two non-officials referred to by the Director of Public Instruction as having first mooted the question of levy of fees in 1937, were nominated members of the Legislative Council or elected members.

The SECOND MEMBER (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman) replied that they were both nominated members.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA stated that this question had been raised and the difficulties of poor parents also explained to Government more than once in the

past. No doubt the Director of Public Instruction had observed that fees in middle schools were levied everywhere except in Mysore. But the speaker would request the Government to bear in mind the earning capacity of the tax-payer in all the countries or provinces where such fees were in vogue. Mysore was an agricultural country, and very few people were able to keep their bodies and souls together, and so the vast majority of people were unable to pay for the education of their children. It might be that the fee would be levied only in cities and towns and even then about 40 per cent of the students would be given freeships. But the speaker was definitely of the opinion that even 40 per cent freeships would not be enough. The Director of Public Instruction said that many people in district and taluk headquarter towns and in the cities could afford to pay fees. But even in such places, the speaker knew there were many who could not pay even the sports fees. Under such circumstances it would become difficult for the parents to educate their children even up to the middle school if fees were levied. Only the previous year the Dewan had been pleased to observe that the raiyat could bear no more taxation. This being so, the present proposal would be like beating the dead horse.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU said that the levy of fees in a particular grade of schools could not be styled as additional taxation.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA was, however, of opinion that levy of fees did amount to fresh taxation.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN observed that education was a service and fees were a legitimate charge therefor.

Proceeding, **Mr. B. L. BYANNA** said that even in 1931, when the Elementary Education Act was introduced, he had opposed it and said that Government were only trying to shirk their responsibility by transferring education to local bodies. At that time, the Government had advanced the plea that they wanted to provide for the education of Adikarnatakas and other minority communities, but the speaker had emphatically stated that that object could never be achieved by the said Act. All that he had then stated had now come to pass, since education had made no progress. Now, even the land revenue proper was being paid by the people with the greatest difficulty, and they would rest content if their children could get education at least up to the middle school stage. But the levy of fees in middle schools would deprive their children even of that much of benefit, and this was a circumstance which poor parents throughout the State were regretting.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN reminded the member that he himself was asking only the other day for high schools for more than one place.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA replied that that did not mean that fees should be levied in all middle schools.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN then stated that it was only a recommendation of the committee that had just been communicated to the House by the Director of Public Instruction and that nothing definite had so far been settled by Government, either in favour of levying fees as proposed or against it.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA spoke in favour of the adjournment motion. He stated that members were satisfied to some extent by the statements of the Director of Public Instruction that members were free to express their considered opinion on this question, and of the Second Member of Council that Government had not made up their minds about levying the fees one way or the other. At the same time, the Director had stated that even when the concession of free education was shown 20 years ago the Government could not have afforded doing so, and now that the number of schools had multiplied and would further multiply in future, Government could not find the funds required for keeping the schools going. And the Director of Public Instruction had stated that by levying fees from 60 per cent of the pupils Government could get one lakh of rupees or slightly more. But the speaker doubted whether it was worth while withdrawing a concession which people had enjoyed

for over 20 years, for the sake of one lakh of rupees. And if such a concession which people were so long used to was withdrawn, it was but natural for them to demur. No doubt, it was stated that they would collect fees only from those parents who paid income-tax . . . .

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN again observed that Government had not decided to levy fees. It was only one of the recommendations of the committee.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA suggested that, if the Government could not get that amount of one lakh of rupees in any other way, they might propose that an octroi duty of one anna per every gallon of imported petrol be levied or that a special education cess of 3 or 4 pies in the rupee be paid by persons assessed to income-tax in the State. But it was doubtless that people were anxious to retain a concession which they were enjoying for 20 years or more.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA opposed the motion now before the House. Everywhere people were agitating for the provision of more schools, hospitals, etc., for repairs to tanks and for hosts of other necessities and amenities, but Government were unable to provide them all, for want of funds. It was therefore the duty of those who wanted those necessities and amenities, to place the necessary funds in the hands of Government. After all the people were not different from the Government. The subjects paid moneys into the State Exchequer and the Government was there to administer them. The more the funds available for expenditure, the greater the facilities which the subjects would get in return. The Director of Public Instruction had just told the House that some schools were not properly equipped and others had no proper accommodation and so on. And in many places there were no schools at all. If all these had to be provided, the Government would require funds to a very large extent. This was why the Government were thinking of levying fees. But Government were fully aware that the raiyats in the villages were very poor and unable to pay for the education of their children. So the Government would exempt all of them from payment. That meant that all those living in the villages would have to pay nothing. It was only those living in the cities and paying income-tax that would have to pay fees for the sake of their own children's education. And even among them, two-thirds would enjoy freeships. In other words only 60 per cent of the pupils in towns and cities would have to pay fees. If they also refused to pay there would be no chance for the expansion of education, specially in the villages, and that would only mean that people who lived in the cities and were quite comfortable did not care for the education of the masses. The speaker therefore requested Government not to attach too much weight to the opposition, but to levy fees as proposed, give more schools, provide better accommodation and better equipment for the existing schools and see that middle school education expanded in all parts of the State.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY said that a few decades ago the attendance at most of the schools in the State was very poor and the percentage of literacy was almost nil. So, with a view to inducing the raiyats to send their children to school and improving the percentage of literacy, the Government had graciously decided to make middle school education free to all alike. Having done it long ago and kept up the concession throughout, it would not be right for the Government to levy fees on middle school education at the present time, for the sake of a few thousands of rupees. The raiyats were unable to pay even the land revenue which they owed to Government, and it was common knowledge that in a large number of cases every year the demand could not be collected even by auctioning the belongings of the defaulters. Such being the case, it was clear that people could not pay fees and get their children educated. The speaker was surprised that Mr. S. Ramappa who lived in a taluk headquarter town and knew the condition of the poor villagers should have supported the levy of fees. He was also not a little surprised that the members of the committee referred to by the First Member of Council had thought it fit to

recommend the levy of fees. If fees were levied, education would receive a set back, and most of the schools in rural parts would have to be closed down. People were finding it exceedingly difficult to pay even the sports fees. Such being the case, it would be cruel to expect them to pay school fees. The revenue which Government would derive in the shape of fees in middle schools would not even equal the expenditure of one of their departments under the head "contingencies" and the loss which they might sustain by forgoing the levy would be but a flea-bite to them. Considering all these circumstances he would appeal to the Government not to withdraw a concession which the subjects of the State had been long accustomed to and for which everybody was grateful.

Mr. Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY, who was a member of the Elementary Education Committee. said that the committee had only recommended that people who could afford to pay fees must do so; and in order that poor people might not be hard hit, they had also recommended 40 per cent freeships. Mr. Vema Reddy must have spoken under a misapprehension when he characterised the recommendation of the committee as cruel. On the other hand, the speaker was satisfied that the members of the committee had specially safeguarded the interests of the poorer classes by recommending freeship for 40 per cent of the pupils. Members of the Assembly had often requested the Government to establish more and more middle schools in various parts of the State, and for granting those requests it had been found that several lakhs of rupees would be required. Government would be graciously pleased to start more schools if at least a lakh of rupees were collected by way of fees. Such being the case, the speaker saw no reason for any complaint. He would request the House to remember that if people agreed to the levy of fees in middle schools, there would be a chance for the spread of middle school education, but if fees were not levied, no expansion would be possible.

Mr. H. K. MADIAH supported the proposal of the committee in the interests of expansion of education. He was of opinion that so long as children of the poor were not made to pay for their education and only those who could pay were made to pay, nobody could have any reason to complain. And just as the poor raiyat in the village paid a cess for educational purposes, it stood to reason that those living in the cities and towns should also pay for the education of their children. The latter had escaped payment so long and it was not right that they should do so even in future.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMY IYER was of opinion that education up to the Lower Secondary stage ought to be free in the case of every subject of the State; nature made no distinctions between one man and another; the rains made no distinctions between hills and dales. Similarly the Government also must help the education of the rich and poor alike. He could not follow the oft-quoted argument that while those in the villages paid for the education of their children, those in the cities and towns paid nothing though their children got the better part of the educational facilities afforded by the Government. The truth of the matter was that while those in the villages paid in the shape of land revenue and cesses thereon, those in the towns and cities paid in the shape of octroi on almost every article of household use, as also special cesses on light, water, sanitation, etc. On the whole, the citizen or townsman paid no less than the villager and as such, the former ought not to be subjected to the special hardship of having to pay for the education of his children up to the middle school stage.

Mr. A. J. KHALEEL stated that levy of fees would adversely affect the education of poor boys and girls. A large majority of Mussalmans were poor, and they would be compelled to withdraw their children from school the moment fees were levied. Generally speaking, it was the poor men's children that studied better and these needed special encouragement instead of being subjected to special hardships. The Government were already spending lakhs of rupees on University education,

and as if that were not enough, they had also proposed to open the B.Com. course in the near future. If only the Government withdrew one or two lakhs of rupees out of what they spent on the University and earmarked that amount for expenditure on elementary education, they would be doing a great service to the bulk of the population. There were any number of M.A.'s and B.A.'s in the country already who did not derive any benefit from their education; but if the Government gave free education up to lower secondary stage many more poor persons could become literate and all of them would ever remain grateful to the Government.

Mr. B. SITHARAMIAH stated that there was a definite promise from Government that fees would not be levied up to the lower secondary stage if the income-tax was levied in the State. Accordingly the Assembly and the Council had agreed to the levy of income-tax and Government were deriving a large revenue from that source. In spite of it the Government were now proposing to levy fees, which was not right. The clear promise held out by Government should not be withdrawn in a light-hearted manner. Besides, levy of fees would deal a severe blow to the cause of education. It was stated that levy of fees would not affect children of the raiyat and it was only the parents in towns and cities that would have to pay for the education of their children. But if only statistics were taken, it would become clear that even in the schools in towns and cities 80 per cent of the pupils would have come from the villages. Thus, the speaker contended, levy of fees would mean hardship to village people mostly. From this point of view, he remarked that it was very unjust on the part of the Government to have countenanced a recommendation to levy fees, and that the representatives of the people could never be expected to agree to it.

Mr. J. DEVAIYA stated that even among those who lived in the towns, there were many who paid land revenue and all the usual cesses thereon, so that it would not be correct to say that all those living in the cities and towns paid nothing. Nor would it be correct to say that schools in towns and cities were not of any benefit to the rural population. Any number of persons had shifted themselves to the cities and taken up service in mills, factories, shops, etc., and all of them were very poor people. Considering these circumstances, he was not in favour of school fees being levied even in towns and cities.

Mr. RASOOL SAB said that so far as towns and cities were concerned, all of them already had schools and expansion was needed more urgently in the villages. And if schools were to be provided in the villages in future it was because so far the villages had not received adequate attention. But this would not justify the levy of fees even in towns and cities. He therefore prayed that the proposal be withdrawn and never again permitted to be mooted.

Mr. B. L. HUTCHAPPA also agreed that a majority of the pupils in schools in towns and cities came from the villages and they would be hit hard by the proposal to levy fees. Only a very small percentage of students belonged to the towns themselves. As a person who was running a hostel himself, he was in a position to state that most of the pupils were poor and could not pay even half the fees. He was therefore definitely opposed to the proposal to levy fees in middle schools.

In replying to the debate, **Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN** stated that he was very glad that the question was discussed at such great length in the Assembly, and, as Chairman of the Elementary Education Committee which had come in for a certain amount of criticism in the course of the discussion, he was in a position to appreciate not merely the points urged by members of the House but also the point of view of the committee which had recommended the levy of fees as a possible means of enabling Government to expand middle school education in the State. The report of that committee had been received not long ago and Government just then had it under consideration. In the opening statement of the Director of Public Instruction, the point of view of

the committee had already been explained to the House. It was natural that people generally opposed any new levy. Mr. L. Vema Reddy, for instance, had spoken somewhat vehemently against the proposal and remarked that he could not understand why the committee should have at all made such an unpopular or 'cruel' recommendation. It would be well if members paused to understand why the committee had made a proposal of that kind, instead of simply saying that fees ought not to be levied and that education ought to be free for one and all. Fees in middle schools were abolished in 1919, because at that time it was not found that some special facilities were called for. But the Director of Public Instruction had already stated that Government could not have afforded that concession even then, and that the position at present, so far as Government were concerned, was much more difficult than ever. The result of the concession having been extended at a time when it could not be afforded was that, while originally about 30 new schools were started every year, even 5 new schools could not be started ever since.

Another point which members must remember was that fees would be levied only in the towns and cities and not in the villages. Government were only too alive to the fact that many boys and girls in the villages were anxious to receive education but there were not facilities enough for them to do so. It stood to reason that that demand was met as far as possible. It was also a fact that even where schools existed, the buildings were not in proper condition, the accommodation had to be added to equipment had to be improved, and so on. At the same time, primary education had to be expanded in all parts of the State. If Government had to take the entire reponsibility for doing all that, it would cost them seven lakhs of rupees, which Government could not afford to incur without trying to augment their resources. Even with the proposed levy, Government would have to be prepared for an extra expenditure of three to four lakhs of rupees. Of course, it was natural that people were unwilling to give up a privilege which they were enjoying for 20 years or more. But as representatives of the people, members of the House should be able to realise the difficulties of Government and their own responsibility in respect of a matter of this kind and should try to devise ways and means of helping Government to get over the difficulties. And this exactly was what the Elementary Education Committee had attempted to do. The committee had bestowed their most anxious consideration on the question and discussed it at very great length and come to a certain understanding; and they were also reasonable in their decision. That decision, no doubt, was not binding upon anybody. But it was pretty clear that if people did not want to pay anything more, they could not have any more schools, but that if they were prepared for some sacrifice, their children could enjoy much better educational facilities. Nobody doubted that everywhere pupils were anxious to receive education but there were not the necessary number of schools to satisfy the growing demand. It was also clear that a substantial number of additional schools would have to be in the villages. Personally the speaker was convinced, from his experience as Deputy Commissioner, as Revenue Commissioner, even as Inspector-General of Police, and now as Member of Council, that the demand for more and more schools was both genuine and urgent. But this demand could only be met to the extent funds were available. And the demand was by no means confined to the rural parts. The Sultanpet school in Bangalore City had developed beyond expectations and had to be bifurcated. The Maharani's School at Mysore had been bifurcated. Many other schools in other towns had to be bifurcated. And new schools had to be opened in a number of taluks like Yedatore, Arkalgud, Honnali, Mandya, Sathnur, Davangere, Chennagiri, etc. Already, there were more than 100 places where schools were required or schools had to be improved. Surely, all this could not be done without money. It was in this

light that members should view the question under discussion and express their considered opinions. It was easy for Government to allow things to drift, but, being responsive to popular demands and wishes, they were anxious to improve matters as far as possible. There was another aspect of the question which the speaker would earnestly ask the members to bear in mind. If the number of pupils in a class was too large for a teacher to manage, he would also become indifferent to his work and the pupils would not be able to derive the best use of the class. Naturally therefore the parents would have to arrange for private tuition at home and this would tax them needlessly. If on the other hand the classes were not unwieldy, the teachers would be able to pay a certain amount of attention to every pupil and there would be no need for the parents to worry about their children's education. Thus it would make for real economy in every household if the levy of fees was agreed to, as a means not only of adding to the number of schools where these were needed but also of ensuring that the classes would in future be reasonable in size in the schools already in existence.

In the light of the foregoing considerations and in the best interests of the education of the coming generations, the speaker requested the members, both as Member in charge of the educational portfolio and as Chairman of the Elementary Education Committee, to take a liberal view of the question and not expect middle school education to be free for all time to come, merely as a matter of privilege or as a concession to which they were long accustomed.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA, while appreciating the point of view of Government, had his own doubts whether expansion of primary education would be a *fait accompli* even after fees were levied in all the middle schools. Personally he feared that the only result of it would be that the school-going population would decrease. He was therefore not in favour of the levy of fees, and pressed the adjournment motion to division.

The motion was put to vote and passed by a majority.

The House adjourned at 5-55 p.m., to meet again at 8 a.m., the following day.

EIGHTH DAY.

Tuesday, 24th October 1939.

The House reassembled at the Jagan Mohan Palace Pavilion on Tuesday, 24th October 1939, at 8 of the clock, Mr. President (*Amin-ul-Mulk* Sir Mirza M. Ismail, K.C.I.E., O.B.E., Dewan) in the Chair.

Felicitations to Recipients of Durbar Honours.

Before the business for the day was taken up, **Mr. L. VEMA REDDY** requested permission of the President to express the felicitations of the House to the following ladies and gentlemen who were recipients of the titles noted against their names, at the hands of His Highness the Maharaja, at the Durbar held the previous night :—

Mr. K. V. Anantaraman, Second Member of Council.	"Rajamantrapravina"
Mr. S. Abdul Wajid, Revenue Commissioner.	"Rukn-ul-Mulk"
Srimathi D. Sakamma, Member, Representative Assembly.	"Lokasevaparayane"